

USAID/PVC Matching Grant Evaluation Series:

*Corporate Community Investment Service (CorCom)*

Matching Grant No. FAO-A-00-98-00071-00 between

*International Medical Services for Health (INMED)* and  
USAID/PVC

**FINAL REPORT**

**October 8, 2002**

Conducted under USAID/Evaluation Indefinite Quantity Contract  
#AEP-I-02-00-00024-01  
Order No. 1

*Evaluation team members:*

**Joan M. Goodin (MSI, Team Leader)**  
**Rosalie Huisinga Norem (INMED)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>List of Acronyms Used.....</b>  | <b>iii</b> |
| <b>Evaluation Identification Sheet.....</b>                                      | <b>iv</b>  |
| <b>1.0 Executive Summary* .....</b>  | <b>1</b>   |
| 1.1 Overview.....  | 1          |
| 1.2 Key findings, conclusions and recommendations .....                          | 1          |
| <b>2.0 Evaluation Methodology and Team Composition* .....</b>                    | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>3.0 Matching Grant Background*.....</b>                                       | <b>4</b>   |
| 3.1 Historical & technical context and partners* .....                           | 4          |
| 3.2 Project goal, objectives, and major hypotheses to be tested* .....           | 6          |
| <b>4.0 Purpose of the Evaluation* .....</b>                                      | <b>7</b>   |
| <b>5.0 Program Implementation Evaluation Questions.....</b>                      | <b>7</b>   |
| 5.1 The Detailed Implementation Plan.....  | 7          |
| 5.1.1 Completed DIP completion and DIP accuracy* .....                           | 7          |
| 5.1.2 Quality of DIP and degree of success in implementation* .....              | 8          |
| 5.1.3 Familiarity with DIP and design* .....                                     | 8          |
| 5.1.4 Major successes and shortfalls in implementation* .....                    | 8          |
| 5.1.5 Impact Results* .....  | 8          |
| 5.2 Assessment of project model and hypotheses .....                             | 9          |
| 5.2.1 Project hypotheses articulated in CA*.....                                 | 9          |
| 5.2.2 Replication and scale-up of approaches in project area or elsewhere* ..... | 12         |
| 5.3 Advocacy under the project .....   | 14         |
| 5.3.1 Advocacy activities and impact* .....                                      | 14         |
| 5.4.2 Partner/PVO roles in advocacy* .....                                       | 15         |
| 5.4 Implementation Lessons Learned.....  | 15         |
| <b>6.0 Partnership Questions .....</b>   | <b>16</b>  |
| 6.1 Analysis of Partnership Schemes* .....                                       | 16         |
| 6.2 Measuring Institutional Capacity* .....                                      | 17         |
| 6.3 Constraints to Partnership* .....  | 17         |
| 6.4 Information Technology* .....  | 17         |
| 6.5 Use of local networks and service organizations*.....                        | 17         |
| <b>7.0 Program Management .....</b>  | <b>17</b>  |
| 7.1 Strategic Approach and Program Planning* .....                               | 17         |
| 7.2 Country Initiatives* .....   | 18         |
| 7.3 Conflict Management* .....   | 18         |
| 7.4 Monitoring and Evaluation* .....   | 18         |
| 7.5 Overall Management* .....  | 18         |
| 7.6 Sustainability*.....   | 19         |

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 7.6.1 Overall sustainability survey*                      | 19                                  |
| 7.7 Financial Management                                  | 19                                  |
| 7.7.1 Effectiveness of financial management*              | 19                                  |
| 7.7.2 Leveraging other donor funds*                       | 20                                  |
| 7.7.3 Cost effectiveness of technical approach*           | 20                                  |
| 7.7.4 Repercussions of “matching” requirement on program* | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 7.8 PVO’s Information Management*                         | 20                                  |
| 7.9 Logistics*  | 20                                  |
| 7.10 Project Supervision*                                 | 20                                  |
| 7.11 USAID Management*                                    | 20                                  |
| <b>8.0 Overall Conclusions*</b>                           | <b>20</b>                           |

|                |          |
|----------------|----------|
| <b>Annexes</b> | <b>1</b> |
|----------------|----------|

**Annex A: Documents Consulted**  
**Annex B: Persons Contacted**  
**Annex C: Evaluation Scope of Work**  
**Annex D: DIP and Other Program Matrices**  
**Annex E: List of PVO & Business Contacts**

### *List of Acronyms Used*

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| BHR    | Bureau of Humanitarian Relief                      |
| BLC    | Business Link Center                               |
| CEO    | Chief Executive Officer                            |
| CTO    | Cognizant Technical Officer                        |
| CorCom | Corporate Community Investment Service             |
| DCHA   | Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance    |
| E&E    | Europe and Eurasia                                 |
| GAO    | General Accounting Office                          |
| INMED  | International Medical Services for Health          |
| MG     | Matching Grant                                     |
| MIS    | Management Information System                      |
| MSI    | Management Systems International                   |
| NGO    | Non-governmental organization                      |
| PACD   | Project Activity Completion Date                   |
| PHN    | Population, Health and Nutrition                   |
| PPC    | Program and Policy Coordination                    |
| PVC    | Private Voluntary Cooperation                      |
| PVO    | Private Voluntary Organization (usually U.S.)      |
| USAID  | United States Agency for International Development |

### *Evaluation Identification Sheet*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| PVO name                               | International Medical Services for Health (INMED) |
| Matching Grant Title                   | CorCom II   |
| Cooperative agreement number           | FAO-A-00-98-00071-00                              |
| Amount of Grant                        | \$627,000   |
| Period of Grant                        | September 25, 1998 September 28, 2001             |
| Any (cost/no cost) extensions?         | No  |
| Current status of MG                   | Completed   |
| USAID/PVC Grant Officer                | Martin Hewitt                                     |
| Technical area of grant                | PVO-business partnerships                         |
| Date of the evaluation                 | August 2002                                       |
| Countries of program activity          | U.S.  |
| Country programs evaluated             | U.S.  |
| Evaluation Team Members (organization) | INMED and MSI                                     |

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.1 Overview

On September 25, 1998, USAID/BHR/PVC awarded a \$600,000 Matching Grant (MG) to International Medical Services for Health (INMED) for the three-year period ending September 28, 2001. The award was in response to an unsolicited proposal submitted to PVC by INMED. While funded with MG resources, the grant was considered experimental, and did not encompass all of the features of a traditional matching grant. The initiative was titled “Corporate Community Investment Service,” known simply as “CorCom.” In June 2000, through Modification No. 2, the grant amount was increased to \$627,000 for the same three-year period, and INMED’s cost-share was reduced from 69 percent to 50 percent.

CorCom was founded in 1996, and its creator came to INMED with the PVC grant to continue serving as its director. The original goal of the program was: *“To promote linkages between nonprofit organizations and business in joint ventures that move beyond philanthropy.”* During year one, the network of PVOs, which had been convened earlier, continued meeting to explore the issues and techniques involved in building partnerships with the private sector. Meanwhile, the CTO actively promoted the CorCom concept within USAID and, together with the CorCom director, also pursued partnership possibilities in the corporate sector.

By year two tensions had arisen between the CorCom director on one hand and INMED officials and the USAID CTO on the other with regard to program “ownership” and future direction. In December 1999, following unsuccessful efforts to mediate these differences, the director left INMED, taking the CorCom name and website with her. The program was then reorganized by INMED in collaboration with the CTO, and the initiative was renamed the Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. The goal was revised as follows: *“Increase private sector funding for development through innovative alliances among PVOs/NGOs, the private sector and USAID.”* However, the original DIP was not revised, nor was a performance monitoring plan formulated. The INMED CEO served as director of the Alliance until a new program director was hired in January 2001.

### 1.2 Key conclusions and recommendations

As described in the various sections of this report, the key conclusions drawn by evaluators from the findings outlined include the following.

#### *Conclusions:*

- ◆ Because from the start both PVC and the grantee considered this to be an experimental activity, learning through experience appeared to be an important purpose. The learning process could have produced clearer lessons if accomplishments and constraints had been monitored more closely through the periodic review and revision of the DIP, particularly program objectives, indicators and targets.
- ◆ Given the marked differences between the two phases of this activity, and the fact that no new indicators or DIP were formulated for Phase 2, it is not possible to measure overall

program performance with any degree of objectivity or accuracy. Judgments about the “success” of program implementation fall within the realm of intuition or individual interpretation.

- ◆ The network coordinated by CorCom during the first year of the grant facilitated relations among participating PVOs and provided useful information and materials for pursuing potential partnerships with the private sector. This, plus the contacts made by CorCom and the CTO within the private sector and at USAID, generated significant awareness of partnerships as an important tool for achieving development goals of interest to all concerned. In a word, CorCom contributed to mainstreaming the concept of partnerships, serving as a catalyst that stimulated awareness of a topic whose time had come.
- ◆ The momentum generated by the program had already begun to diminish when it was interrupted by the separation of CorCom from INMED. However, the rupture did cause general confusion and significant delay associated with the need to dedicate time and effort to re-calibrating the overall program plan and the activities to be undertaken.
- ◆ Replication or scale-up of program experience in the field is complicated by the organizational structures of the parties involved. Buy-in at one level - whether within PVOs, businesses or USAID - is not sufficient to ensure success. It is necessary to understand the flow of authority between the various layers of the organizations, and to educate and win the support of key personnel at all levels.
- ◆ This program was effective in terms of promoting the concept of nonprofit-business partnerships as a new development paradigm. There is anecdotal evidence of heightened awareness of and support for the concept of partnerships within both the PVO and business communities. However, the clearest evidence of impact is within USAID, where official policy now espouses the concept of partnerships and the Agency is actively engaged in their pursuit.
- ◆ Though it is not possible to assess the degree of change in the operational and management capacity of participating PVOs, it is clear that program activities did stimulate increased awareness of and interest in pursuing partnerships with the private sector within the PVO community at large.
- ◆ The market for the types of information and services offered by the Alliance is not yet well enough developed to support the costs associated with program operations.

### ***Recommendations:***

Because of the time elapsed between the completion of grant activities and this evaluation, for the most part the improvements that might have been recommended a year ago have already been taken into account in the follow-on Matching Grant awarded to INMED, or have been made redundant by circumstances. Therefore, the team formulated only one fundamental recommendation for the consideration of PVC as it plans future strategies. It is as follows:

- ◆ To facilitate the learning process when funding experimental initiatives, PVC should expect DIPs to be modified periodically, requiring that grantees establish performance monitoring systems designed to capture results at specific intervals. Information should then be analyzed and used to modify on-going objectives and activities in concert with the CTO.

### 1.3 Acknowledgements

Members of the evaluation team wish to express our appreciation to PVC for this opportunity to work on such an interesting assignment. Our special thanks go to the CTO who was so instrumental in guiding the activities undertaken through this grant, and to INMED staff for the spirit of cooperation with which they received our requests for information and facilitated our work. Likewise, we are grateful to the PVO representatives, corporate officers and other individuals who shared their time, knowledge and opinions with us. Each of the individuals contacted made a significant contribution to the overall results recorded here. We thank them all.

## 2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TEAM COMPOSITION

### Approach:

The methodology employed for this evaluation consisted of document review, interviews with key informants and discussions among team members to confirm findings, conclusions and recommendations. All evaluation tasks were carried out in the Washington, DC area during the following major phases:

#### *Phase One:*

- ◆ Preparatory work – Half-day Team Planning Meeting with USAID officials and key INMED representatives (July 17, 2002) and document review at MSI headquarters.

#### *Phase Two:*

- ◆ Interviews with key informants, including the USAID CTO, INMED officials, representatives of participating PVOs, businesses, and related individuals.

#### *Phase Three:*

- ◆ Preparation/submission of draft report on August 28, 2002.
- ◆ Incorporation of USAID and INMED comments, and production of final report.

As indicated in the various sections of this report, data were verified through the review of key documents (see **Annex A** for a complete list) and interviews with relevant individuals and groups (**Annex B** provides a list of persons contacted). Findings are based on the information collected, while conclusions and recommendations are the opinions and suggestions offered by the evaluation team.

### Report Format:

It should be noted that the team was asked to use a pre-determined format for the preparation of



this report. This is to facilitate future study and the synthesis of data at the level of the overall PVC Matching Grant program. However, as noted in the Scope of Work for this evaluation (see *Annex C*), due to its experimental nature, the grant did not encompass all of the elements of a standard matching grant. Therefore, non-applicable sections of the report format are marked simply “N/A.”

### **Team Composition:**

The evaluation team was comprised of the following members:

- ◆ **Joan Goodin**, MSI Senior Associate, served as Team Leader. Ms. Goodin has led a number of USAID evaluations, including the PVC Matching Grant to CARE, and is a specialist in the field of civil society. She is also under contract to PVC to prepare a synthesis of major themes emerging from the current series of PVC Matching Grant evaluations.
- ◆ **Rosalie Huisinga Norem**, Director of INMED’s Millennium Alliance for Social Investment, has long experience with USAID programming and procedures, having consulted for PVC as a strategic planning facilitator, Matching Grant lead evaluator and Matching Grant proposal reviewer over a five-year period. In addition, she worked for five years as director of a USAID project. She also has extensive experience with the U.N. system, DFID, FINIDA and the Dutch Government.

## **3.0 MATCHING GRANT BACKGROUND**

### **3.1 Historical & technical context**

On September 25, 1998, USAID/BHR/PVC awarded a \$600,000 Matching Grant (MG) to International Medical Services for Health (INMED) for the three-year period ending September 28, 2001. The award was in response to an unsolicited proposal submitted to PVC by INMED. While funded with MG resources, the grant was considered experimental, and did not encompass all of the features of a traditional matching grant. The initiative was titled “Corporate Community Investment Service,” known simply as “CorCom.” In June 2000, through Modification No. 2, the grant amount was increased to \$627,000 for the same three-year period, and INMED’s cost-share was reduced from 69 percent to 50 percent.

Before exploring the details of this activity, it is important to understand how it began and how it evolved during the three-year period of the grant. The following paragraphs summarize the major highlights of that process.

CorCom was created in 1996 by its Director as a means of exploring and facilitating partnerships between nonprofit organizations and businesses for purposes of achieving development goals. Under contract to PACT, the CorCom Director began convening an informal network of PVOs who met on a monthly basis to share experiences regarding public-private relationships and learn from one another. Early literature states, “The mission of PACT’s CorCom is to stimulate linkages between the business and nonprofit sectors in advancing their mutual interests in sustainable economic and social development.” CorCom also sponsored a number of meetings with business representatives and development practitioners to gather ideas about how the program should be designed.

That early effort had captured the attention of a representative of PVC (who later became the MG CTO), who was also convinced that PVO-business partnerships could make a significant contribution to development. He spoke with PVC officials and in December 1997 CorCom convened a strategic planning session attended by some ten representatives of PVOs and the World Bank, plus the PVC Office Director, Deputy Director and three other staff members. In early 1998, PVC provided a Purchase Order for implementation of the three workshops called for in the strategic plan developed at the December session. As stated in the Purchase Order, based on the enthusiasm generated, “It is important now to bring lessons learned about partnerships, how they started, how well they work, and the ethical issues, into the public domain where other PVOs and businesses can discuss their experiences openly and learn from their experiences.” Reports were produced following each workshop, and the information and ideas generated were consolidated by the CorCom Director into a step-by-step guide titled *Partnerships with Business: A Practical Guide for Nonprofit Organizations*.

On April 24, 1998, PVC received an unsolicited proposal from INMED “for growing CorCom into a strong PVO/private sector network.” Project documents verify that, “In 1998, USAID formalized its relationship with CorCom and awarded INMED a Cooperative Agreement to implement CorCom in conjunction with its developer.” Reportedly, since CorCom needed a legally recognized, nonprofit home in order to receive a MG, and because INMED, through its *Millennium* conferences, had demonstrated its commitment to facilitating public-private partnerships, it was determined that housing the project there would be an appropriate fit.

As noted in CorCom’s year one report to PVC (dated December 1, 1999), “This was the first secure funding for the project and came with a designated director and strategic plans based on prior activities.” Interviewees confirmed that questions concerning the “ownership” and direction of the project had led to tensions between the CorCom director and INMED officials. In December 1999, following unsuccessful efforts to resolve these differences, the director left INMED, taking the CorCom name and website with her. With her departure, the project was reorganized and renamed the Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. Its new purpose and strategies were formulated through planning sessions with PVC and based on the results of an assessment commissioned by PVC to explore CorCom’s effect on participating organizations with regard to forming partnerships.

In January 2001, a new director was hired, and the Alliance was fully integrated into INMED’s own objectives, MIS and other systems.

In short, the overall project chronology may be depicted as follows:

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| October 1998/December 1999  | CorCom activities carried out under the direction of its creator |
| January/March 2000          | Project reorganized, with new objectives & strategies            |
| April/September 2000        | Millennium Alliance for Social Investment launched               |
| October 2000/September 2001 | Alliance future planning and                                     |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
|                        | promotion of formal partnerships                       |
| January/September 2001 | MG completed under management of new Alliance director |

### 3.2 Project goals and objectives

The Cooperative Agreement included a one-page Program Description, which stated that the Program Goal was “to promote linkages between nonprofit organizations and business in joint ventures that move beyond philanthropy.” While no objectives were included, a “program strategy” consisting of four “key elements” was presented.

The information provided in the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) was more complete, though the goal was expressed in a different manner. The hierarchy of goals and objectives presented in the DIP were in effect through Year 1 and the first quarter of Year 2 (Phase 1). They were as follows:

**Table 3.2: Project Hierarchy of Objectives – Phase 1**

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Goal:        | To stimulate linkages between business and nonprofit development organizations to pursue their mutual interests in building economically viable and politically stable communities in developing countries. |
| Objective 1: | Establish sustainable mechanisms for promoting partnerships between businesses and PVOs including a network of practitioners, a Business Link Center and a web site.  |
| Objective 2: | Build the capacity of PVOs and NGOs to diversify their funding base by building partnerships with business.   |
| Objective 3: | Create partnerships by educating the private sector on advantages of working with NGO partners.   |

As a result of the reorganization of the program, according to the Report for Year 2 (dated November 2000), the following goal and objectives were adopted. However, no new DIP was developed.

#### **Phase 2**

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Goal:        | Increase private sector funding for development through innovative alliances among PVOs/NGOs, the private sector and USAID.   |
| Objective 1: | Develop opportunities for alliances between PVOs/NGOs and the private sector that increase funding for development activities that are in line with USAID strategies. |
| Objective 2: | Broker and help to ensure the success of alliances by providing crucial linkages and supporting services.   |
| Objective 3: | Facilitate 3-way partnerships among USAID, the private sector and PVOs/NGOs.  |

It is interesting to note that a set of five strategies and five quantifiable outcomes linked to those strategies were included in the Report for Year 2. However, while the same goal, objectives and outcomes were listed in the Year 3 Report, a series of six, less ambitious strategies was included. (See **Annex D3** for a matrix showing the Evolution of the Program over the Three Year Period of the MG.)

Also included in the *Annex (D1 and D2)* are two additional matrices – one from the Phase 1 CorCom DIP, and another from the Second Year Annual Report, which shows the Millennium Alliance’s goal, objectives and outcomes for Phase 2 as a result of the reorganization.

## **4.0 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

The purpose of this final evaluation is to fulfill the requirements of USAID/DCHA/PVC’s Matching Grant Program, which will use this information to assess how well the MG met its objectives. \* In addition, together with other MG assessments, this evaluation is to assist PVC in:

- ◆ determining patterns and emerging issues across all MG funded programs;
- ◆ identifying the technical support needs for grantees;
- ◆ shaping new MG RFAs;
- ◆ developing internal and external documents to demonstrate the effectiveness of the M program; and
- ◆ sharing lessons learned with the entire PVO community.

The second purpose of this evaluation is to help INMED assess, articulate and learn from its experience in implementing the MG-funded CorCom/Millennium Alliance initiative over the three year period. The lessons learned from this experience can help guide INMED in the future.

## **5.0 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

### **5.1 The Detailed Implementation Plan**

#### **5.1.1 MEETING DIP TARGETS AND DATA ACCURACY**

Findings:

- (a) The first matrix in *Annex D* includes the goal, objectives and other information related to the Phase 1 CorCom DIP. As shown, at the Objective level, of the 14 indicators listed, 12 (88%) were non-specific in terms of PACD targets. Of the remaining two, one was met (web site operating) and one was not (Business Link Center in operation). At the Activity level, eight (57%) of the 14 indicators were non-specific. Of the remaining six, half were met.
- (b) The second matrix included in the *Annex* contains information for Phase 2, following program reorganization and the transition to the Millennium Alliance. While the original DIP was not revised, nor new indicators formulated, a new goal, objectives and PACD targets were agreed upon by INMED and the CTO. Of the six targets set, three (50%) were met and three were not.

Conclusions:

- (a) Because from the start both PVC and the grantee considered this to be an experimental activity, learning through experience appeared to be an important purpose. The learning process could have produced clearer lessons if accomplishments and

---

\* It should be noted that PVC awarded INMED a three-year, follow-on MG for Alliance work beginning in October 2001. However, this evaluation does not cover those activities.

constraints had been monitored more closely through the periodic review and revision of the DIP, particularly program objectives, indicators and targets.

- (b) Given the marked differences between the two phases of this activity, and the fact that no new indicators or DIP were formulated for Phase 2, it is not possible to measure overall program performance with any degree of objectivity or accuracy.

### **5.1.2 QUALITY OF DIP & DEGREE OF SUCCESS IN IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **Findings:**

- (a) As explained, the DIP for this program was limited to Phase 1. It was found to be of only fair quality, in that it did not include targets, and there was no direct correlation between indicators, data collection methods and “Major Planned Activities.”

#### **Conclusions:**

- (a) Given the absence of firm targets and a system for the regular collection and retention of performance data, judgments about the “success” of program implementation fall within the realm of intuition or individual interpretation.

#### **Recommendations:**

- (a) To facilitate the learning process when funding experimental initiatives, PVC should expect DIPs to be modified periodically, requiring that grantees establish performance monitoring systems designed to capture results at specific intervals. Information should then be analyzed and used to modify on-going objectives and activities in concert with the CTO.

### **5.1.3 FAMILIARITY WITH DIP AND DESIGN**

#### **Findings:**

- (a) The DIP approved by the CTO was developed largely by the CorCom staff with little input or sense of “ownership” by INMED as the grantee. It was in force for the first five quarters of the program though, reportedly, it was never used as a management tool. Following program reorganization and the inception of Phase 2, the DIP was “retired,” and a new goal, objectives, and PACD targets were set.
- (b) The Phase 2 plan, developed by INMED in concert with the CTO, was an outline of overall program direction, with quantifiable targets set for each objective. INMED staff were very familiar with the plan, though it was not used as a management tool. Reportedly, this was due to the “opportunistic” nature of the program, which sought to identify and pursue openings as they arose.

### **5.1.4 MAJOR SUCCESSES AND SHORTFALLS IN IMPLEMENTATION**

### **5.1.5 Impact Results**

Based on review of the DIP, the plan for Phase 2 and other documents, as well as interviews with key informants, highlights of implementation experience are summarized in the table below.

**Table 5.1.4: Major Successes and Shortcomings in Implementation**

| <b>Implementation Experience at a Glance</b>  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Major Successes</b>  | <b>Major Shortcomings</b>   |
| The program facilitated relations among the PVOs that participated in the Phase 1 network.                                      |   |
| Awareness of and knowledge about partnerships with business (beyond philanthropy) were heightened within the PVO community.     | No program monitoring plan was developed, nor was a system for collecting and storing indicator data established, which mitigated against the tracking of results.  |
|   | Overcoming the rift that occurred at the end of Year 1 between the CorCom director on one hand and INMED and USAID on the other consumed considerable time and effort, creating confusion and retarding program operations.                                   |
| The program produced some of the first materials aimed at PVOs on partnerships with the private sector.                         |   |
| A number of opportunities for concrete PVO-business partnerships for work in developing countries were identified and explored. | Organizational structures within PVOs, USAID and businesses, and the lack of communication or agreement between headquarters and field offices meant having to work at various levels of the same organization, which greatly complicated the overall effort. |
| Activities led to subsequent fee-based contracts to INMED for research/planning services from at least two corporations.        | The Business Link Center was never created, nor was a Business Plan developed for that purpose.   |
|   | The international conferences planned for Years 2 and 3 did not take place.   |

## **5.2 Assessment of project model and hypotheses**

### **5.2.1 APPROPRIATENESS OF PROJECT HYPOTHESES ARTICULATED IN CA**

#### **Findings:**

- (a) The two major, interlocking hypotheses on which this MG was based were as follows:
- i) *that, in the face of dwindling foreign assistance, motivating and enabling nonprofit organizations and businesses to move beyond philanthropy and enter into strategic alliances or partnerships would lead to increased private sector investment in community development and enhance the overall development effort;* and
  - ii) *that, based on fees for partnership brokering and the sale of other services and materials,*

*CorCom could become a sustainable nonprofit business.* The approaches taken for testing these hypotheses are summarized in the following paragraphs.

(b) The original plan for this three-year grant called for a phased approach to motivating and educating nonprofits and businesses about partnerships, while building CorCom's revenue base:

- ◆ In Year One, a network of PVOs (which had been formed prior to this grant) continued to meet for monthly "skill-building sessions" aimed at "grooming them to be more effective partners to business." Some revenue was to be generated through the sale of a book and consulting services.
- ◆ Year Two activities called for "educating businesses about the advantages of nonprofit partners and formalizing the Business Link Center [BLC] with a fee structure for brokering alliances." Revenue was to be generated from brokerage services, the continued sale of the book and other publications, and sponsorship of a major international conference. It was also anticipated that "some joint proposals submitted with partners will be funded for special activities."
- ◆ Year Three was to see the "expansion of the services of the BLC and the creation of international activities with the establishment of programs aimed at national NGOs and businesses in three target countries." The BLC was to generate additional revenue by expanding the number of clients registered and operating more actively overseas. Revenues were also to be generated from the website (advertisements and services for sale) and several special initiatives with specific business sectors such as the oil/gas industry, the garment/toy/assembly industry, and the health sector.

(c) Through monthly network meetings, participating PVOs did become much more aware of and interested in joint ventures with the private sector. By the end of Year One, they were eager to move beyond information sharing to more specific dialogue with the private sector. An assessment of CorCom's effect on member organizations dated February 2000 found that the most common sentiment among the 12 PVOs contacted was: "the early meetings had had their intended effect: overcoming NGO unwillingness to engage in dialogue with for-profits." It was strongly recommended that, "It is now time to move forward away from the 'should we?' to the 'how do we?'" There was a strong call for setting up a forum where PVOs and companies could come together to explore partnership issues.

A number of network participants interviewed for this evaluation indicated that CorCom had engendered high expectations initially but, as one put it: "it ended with only PVO representatives coming together; they had a hard time getting business to come." Some felt that the opportunity afforded by the network to become acquainted with other PVOs had been its greatest asset. A number of interviewees asserted that the value of the network had declined over time; that it needed to move to the next level, discussing with business how to put what they had learned in practice. A few felt that their organizations had contributed more than they got out of the network.

Program reports and information from key interviewees indicate that, while business representatives did not participate regularly in network sessions, both CorCom and the USAID CTO were actively engaged in exploring partnership opportunities in the private sector. The year one report gives various examples of PVO-business links that were made informally, noting that none had produced concrete results. Though no hard evidence was provided, the report also stated that, thanks to the internal changes resulting from participation in the network, “members (and other PVOs) have managed to develop many more partnerships with businesses on their own.” It was then noted that, “A major challenge for CorCom is the unwillingness of network members to give CorCom credit for partnership matches... it is difficult for CorCom to take credit for them.”

The report credited the CTO with “raising the visibility of the model [CorCom] within USAID,” having “stimulated discussions on the topic with other offices, bureaus and policy makers.” This had led to collaboration with the E&E Bureau in an effort to establish partnerships within the oil sector in the Caspian Sea region (discussed later), and to contacts with PHN, PPC and other operating units.\*

By the end of Year One, tension had arisen between the CorCom director, who felt a proprietary relationship with the program, and the representatives of INMED, which was the official PVC grantee. These differences related to future directions, including the creation of a fee-based Business Link Center, which, according to program documents, was to “charge to broker deals between BLC clients and businesses.” INMED reported that it had supported the original concept of an overall service center for facilitating partnerships, and that it had hired a marketing/fundraising consultant with matching funds to raise money for the BLC. However, under the CorCom director, the concept for the Center became focused solely on the development of a central electronic database for linking PVOs/NGOs and businesses. INMED felt that, given the complexity of brokering and facilitating partnerships, it would be a waste of scarce resources to support the creation of a computer system for matching names. Despite attempts to mediate these differences, by December 1999 they resulted in the departure of the CorCom director, who took with her ownership of the CorCom name and its website. A three-month period of reorganization followed, and the program began Phase Two as the “Millennium Alliance for Social Investment.” The goal shifted from stimulating linkages to increasing private sector funding for development through alliances with PVOs/NGOs, the private sector and USAID.

- (d) As reported by various PVO representatives, the departure of CorCom and shift to the Millennium Alliance caused confusion and, in some cases, suspicion. While CorCom continued convening network meetings to the end of 2000, INMED/Alliance chose to work with PVOs on an individual basis, assessing them in accordance with the type of program to be explored and the relevance of their field locations. It was found that this had been interpreted by some as a lack of transparency and had raised questions about

---

\* Indeed, there is reason to believe that this MG stimulated the creation of the Global Development Alliance (GDA), a priority of the current USAID Administrator.



INMED's intentions, particularly since INMED bills itself as both *facilitator* and *implementor* of partnerships.

- (e) In Phase 2, INMED played a more proactive role in leading the Alliance, incorporating it more fully into the organization. The INMED CEO, with support from the Executive Vice President and other staff, acted as program director for approximately one year. A new Alliance director was not hired until January 2001 because the INMED Alliance staff and the CTO agreed to explore a number of avenues for partnership, and it was recognized by all that there were not sufficient resources to comprehensively focus on any single area. Therefore, INMED decided that it would not be wise to hire a new director until a clearer path for the future was decided. During this period, various avenues were pursued, leading to significant learnings for the future. Among these avenues were the following:
- Working to help ensure that PVOs/NGOs could be successful in partnerships with business. This included meetings with the Drucker Foundation and The Aspen Institute, resulting in informal agreements to provide the management training and facilitation of partnerships for PVOs/NGOs once formed.
  - Working with USAID to assess its direct involvement with businesses and to develop roles for PVOs/NGOs in the process. The most comprehensive effort involved Monsanto and the E&E Bureau. The Alliance facilitated meetings, “translated” corporate and USAID jargon, and prepared proposals for three different countries. While the effort did not result in a partnership with USAID, it did demonstrate the need for a facilitator to translate ideas between the corporate and government sectors. Other Alliance efforts with the CTO included meetings with the USAID Forestry Department, Global Bureau and PHN, as well as with companies of interest to them.
  - Developing business partnership opportunities for PVOs/NGOs. The Alliance promoted within Johnson&Johnson an interest in developing a regional strategy for their social investments in Asia in partnership with PVOs/NGOs and USAID. It produced a document with background information on non-profits in six Asian countries, and the CTO contacted USAID missions for background on local NGOs. This effort is still in progress. The Montecristi Consortium project in the Haiti-DR border area was also developed during this period, and energy companies were designated as a priority with the CTO, and partnerships with a number of them were pursued.
- (f) It was reported that no particular approach to assessing potential partnerships was used, but that it was “opportunistic.” There were three main sources for identifying businesses: those that contacted the CTO; companies that INMED had worked with; and those met at conferences. Various potential partnerships were pursued and, while none came to fruition during the life of this grant, some are still pending. The major constraint was reported to be *time* – both staff time and the time required for partnerships to mature, which involves work at several levels within any given organization. (*Annex E* provides a list of the PVOs and businesses with which INMED was in contact during the final years of the grant.)

- (g) On the second hypothesis and the question of sustainability, the original business plan posited creation of the Business Link Center as the central income-generating element, which was to be expanded over time. Thus, the plan became invalid with the CorCom/INMED separation and the decision to forego the BLC. INMED did not formulate a new sustainability plan until after this grant ended. During the life of the MG, small amounts of revenue were reported for year one, including dues paid by nine organizational and individual network members and the sale of a few copies of the book on partnerships written for PVO audiences prior to the grant. By the third year, the Alliance was beginning to receive fees for research/planning services from Johnson&Johnson, and after the end of this grant, Monsanto retained the Alliance to develop a global strategy for moving beyond philanthropy to social investment. Also pending is a partnership with the Montecristi Consortium, which is to pay the Alliance a fee to coordinate PVO/NGO/business involvement in a community development program in the Dominican Republic/Haiti border area.
- (h) With regard to fulfilling the cost-share requirements of the grant, the percentage was lowered from 69% in year one to 50% for the remaining two years. It was reported that in year one, the match achieved had been .55 cents to \$1, while the match for the overall grant totaled .50 cents to \$1.

#### Conclusions:

- (a) The network coordinated by CorCom during the first year of the grant facilitated relations among participating PVOs and provided useful information and materials for pursuing potential partnerships with the private sector. This, plus the contacts made by CorCom and the CTO within the private sector and at USAID, generated significant awareness of partnerships as an important tool for achieving development goals of interest to all concerned. In a word, CorCom contributed to mainstreaming the concept of partnerships, serving as a catalyst that stimulated awareness of a topic whose time had come.
- (b) The momentum generated by the program had already begun to diminish when it was interrupted by the separation of CorCom from INMED. However, the rupture did cause general confusion and significant delay associated with the need to dedicate time and effort to re-calibrating the overall program plan and the activities to be undertaken.

### **5.2.2 Replication and scale-up of approaches in project area or elsewhere**

#### Findings:

- (a) The original DIP envisioned the development of mini-CorCom networks in three target countries. However, the only apparent attempt at such replication involved collaboration with the E&E Bureau in an effort to establish CorCom in the Caspian Sea area. A field trip to the Caucasus by the CorCom director and a representative of E&E took place in October 1999 for the purpose of exploring the potential for establishing CorCom as one of two “new regional initiatives [that] would support existing USAID programs in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, and expand the Bureau’s outreach to businesses both in the U.S. and overseas.” The trip report makes clear that, based on

the partnership opportunities identified and the support offered by the USAID missions, the feasibility of establishing a regional CorCom operation in the Caucasus was demonstrated. The team met with business and PVO representatives, as well as USAID mission personnel. According to the trip report, “The corporations visited indicated that they would welcome a new, systematic approach to implementing their community development programs and are interested in moving from charity to supporting sustainable development.” It also stated that, “The majority of U.S. PVOs are interested in developing partnerships with the private sector,” though the team found that: “The PVO Head Offices in the U.S. have embraced the business-links approach through their membership in the CorCom network but marketing these new approaches has not yet reached the field.” (When asked about this, PVO interviewees stressed that because field staff are responsible for specific programs, their SOWs do not permit them to dedicate time to other activities.)

USAID missions in the region were very supportive of the initiative, and were willing to provide half of the funding needed for a full-time CorCom representative to coordinate on-site follow up on the opportunities identified, as recommended by the team. However, the head of the E&E Bureau, despite the strong recommendation of his own technical officer, refused to provide the other half (some \$50,000). Thus, it was not possible to launch the initiative. (Reportedly, neither the PVOs nor the businesses involved were asked to provide the necessary funding.)

#### Conclusions:

- (a) Replication or scale-up of program experience in the field is complicated by the organizational structures of the parties involved. Buy-in at one level - whether within PVOs, businesses or USAID - is not sufficient to ensure success. It is necessary to understand the flow of authority between the various layers of the organizations, and to educate and win the support of key personnel at all levels.

## 5.2 Advocacy under the project

### 5.3.1 ADVOCACY ACTIVITIES AND IMPACT

#### Findings:

- (a) Advocacy in the traditional sense was not among the objectives of this grant. It did, however, advocate for or promote recognition and adoption of a new development paradigm – that moving beyond philanthropy to strategic alliances or partnerships between nonprofits and the private sector would increase community investments and strengthen the development effort.
- (b) PVO interviewees reported that early meetings of the CorCom network had served to crystallize notions about the advantages of partnerships with business and, in some cases, to influence their approach to creating them. A number of business representatives reported that through this program they had learned more about how both nonprofits and USAID work. Some business representatives indicated that what was particularly new to them was the concept of working with USAID, and that this experience had helped to reduce the inherent distrust between the public and private

sector. In describing the current climate vis-à-vis partnerships within their respective sectors, both PVO and business representatives described this approach as “inevitable” in the face of shrinking resources. Most believed that the potential for mutually advantageous partnerships is huge.

- (c) It appears that within USAID this program did have a significant effect on policy. This finding is supported by an April 2002 report to Congress by the General Accounting Office (GAO), which explains that, under the Millennium Alliance, USAID funds a cooperative agreement with a U.S. PVO “to match businesses and nonprofits for strategic community investments and to provide training and technical assistance to make the partnerships work.” It then states: “Such efforts serve as models for USAID’s new Global Development Alliance, a major element of its current development strategy.”

#### Conclusions:

- (a) This program was effective in terms of promoting the concept of nonprofit-business partnerships as a new development paradigm. There is anecdotal evidence of heightened awareness of and support for the concept of partnerships within both the PVO and business communities. However, the clearest evidence of impact is within USAID, where official policy now espouses the concept of partnerships and the Agency is actively engaged in their pursuit.

#### 5.3.2 Partner/PVO roles in advocacy – N/A

### 5.4 Implementation Lessons Learned

#### Findings:

- (a) In its second annual report, INMED stated: “Beginning in Year 3, the Alliance will focus on articulating its partnership models, formalizing tools, and documenting best practices.” In developing such models, the report explains: “There will be many more lessons to learn as the paradigm of public-private partnerships continues to evolve. For example, both companies and PVOs/NGOs must learn to confront issues of transparency, self-interest, confidentiality and mutual accountability.”

Reportedly, no real partnership models emerged. INMED indicated that such models are still in the development stage. However, the various attempts to create partnership opportunities described earlier resulted in the identification of four approaches that the Alliance could effectively pursue:

- i) Development of regional/global business strategies that involve PVOs/NGOs (J&J example).
- ii) Facilitation of meetings between companies and USAID to develop projects that leverage resources and meet USAID and PVO priorities (Monsanto example).
- iii) Negotiation/consultation with corporate consortia to develop large scale partnership and contracting mechanisms for commercial/nonprofit initiatives (Montecristi example).
- iv) Facilitation of meetings between businesses investing in particular countries and PVOs/NGOs and USAID working there. (Planned with BPAmoco for Angola,

but never implemented because the company withdrew from the country.)

The tools developed during the grant consisted of the documents produced as a result of pre-grant activities, particularly the book aimed at PVOs on how to build partnerships with business. The companion publication targeting business did not materialize. Moreover, based on experience, it was determined that there are no “best practices” in this work; there are only different types of actors and situations. Therefore, no new tools or documented best practices were produced during the last two years of the grant.

(b) The other major lessons reported by interviewees included the following:

- ◆ Accountability is a priority issue, particularly in countries with high levels of corruption. The representative of one large corporation working in Eastern Europe reported, for example, that they were “only comfortable with U.S. PVOs, not local NGOs, because corruption was so bad.” He explained that working with PVOs provided “protection and ethics.”
- ◆ Full disclosure of the interests of all concerned, and transparency in on-going dialogue and negotiations are essential for building the necessary level of trust.
- ◆ Developing partnerships is extremely complicated and time-consuming. On one hand, a considerable investment of staff time is required to ensure that all levels of any given organization are on board, while on the other, it simply takes time for partnership arrangements to evolve and mature.
- ◆ It is necessary to learn the structures of the organizations involved in order to ensure sufficient internal support for potential partnerships. On the business side, it is also necessary to identify the specific areas within the corporation to which services should be targeted.

## **6.0 PARTNERSHIP QUESTIONS**

### **6.1 Analysis of Partnership Schemes**

Findings:

- (a) While the goal of this program was to “stimulate linkages” or “innovative alliances among PVOs/NGOs, the private sector and USAID,” it did not involve the type of partnership schemes usually envisioned in PVC Matching Grants. That is, the grantee in this case did not seek to partner with or contribute to other organizations as a function of grant implementation. Rather, it sought to stimulate partnerships among the three sectors mentioned.
- (b) Great interest was expressed by all interviewees in the development of partnerships in which the contributions of the various partners mesh and are mutually supportive. It was pointed out that the strengths of the three sectors involved include the following:
- ◆ USAID has credibility with governments, as well as programmatic skills;
  - ◆ Corporations have research/technological/product development skills;
  - ◆ PVOs/NGOs have on-the-ground experience and knowledge of the socio-political and economic context at the community level.

- (c) A good number of interviewees stated that one of the most important aspects of partnership-building is clarity in terms of vision and purpose, along with full transparency concerning what is to be gained by each party.
- (d) No evidence was found of any systematic effort to transmit the concept of partnership to local NGOs or businesses. In one case, it was reported that a PVO's failure to involve its local NGO partners in partnership planning in advance of a trip to the field had led to community-level protest and rejection of the plan, which had to be abandoned.

## **6.2 Measuring Institutional Capacity – N/A**

## **6.3 Constraints to Partnership**

### **Findings:**

- (a) Interviewees spoke of the constraints confronted when attempting to develop specific partnerships. For the most part, these related to the large amount of time and effort required. A lack of experience and knowledge on the part of PVOs of the substantive aspects and local legal framework associated with the introduction of particular technologies was mentioned by the representative of a large corporation as having been a serious constraint. And PVOs spoke of the lack of feedback and information from potential corporate partners as well as from CorCom. The overall constraint mentioned most frequently was the lack of institutional commitment at all levels and the “false starts” this had caused. Interviewees from all three sectors spoke of the bureaucratic hurdles and contradictory views encountered at the various levels of USAID as the main constraint to three-way partnerships.

## **6.4 Information Technology – N/A**

## **6.5 Use of local networks and service organizations – N/A**

# **7.0 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

## **7.1 Strategic Approach and Program Planning**

### **Findings:**

- (a) As noted in the SOW, this grant was not designed to strengthen INMED's planning or management capacity. However, one purpose of the grant was to build the capability of the PVO community to seek corporate sector funding and to initiate partnerships with businesses. In this regard, some evidence was found that the early sessions of the CorCom network did strengthen the knowledge base of participating PVO representatives. What is not clear is the extent to which participants shared that knowledge within their organizations or, if shared, the impact it may have had on the internal management capacity to initiate or maintain partnerships with the corporate sector.

- (b) No concrete evidence was found of any direct effect of program activities on the operational or technical capacity of participating PVOs. In several cases, however, it was found that within the last several years PVOs have created new positions or offices to pursue partnership initiatives. This was said to be in response to “an idea whose time has come,” rather than as a result of CorCom or the Alliance.
- (c) It must be noted that once an organization decides to pursue corporate partnerships, information concerning those efforts or their results is considered proprietary and is closely held – which, for obvious reasons, is not surprising. It is therefore difficult to assess improvements, whether technical or operational.
- (d) While not personally involved in program activities, an official of the major PVO association, InterAction, asserted that: “Interest by PVOs in partnerships is much broader than before, partly by necessity because of reduced funding.” He explained that in March 2001, the InterAction Board had for the first time officially approved raising money from the private sector, but that it “has moved away from that to partnerships.” He participates on the Corporate Citizenship Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, which is mandated to explore corporate/nonprofit partnership experience. Finally, he mentioned that some PVOs are “uncomfortable” with the idea of partnerships, but that now “there are examples out there.”

#### Conclusions:

- (a) Though it is not possible to assess the degree of change in the operational and management capacity of participating PVOs, it is clear that program activities did stimulate increased awareness of and interest in pursuing partnerships with the private sector within the PVO community at large.

## 7.2 Country Initiatives – N/A

## 7.3 Conflict Management – N/A

## 7.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

#### Findings:

- (a) As reported earlier, no performance monitoring plan was developed for this grant. It appears that, because this was considered an “experimental” program, based on an “opportunistic” approach to partnership formation, INMED was not required by PVC to put in place the type of M&E system expected for more traditional Matching Grants.

## 7.5 Overall Management

#### Findings:

- (a) In terms of overall program management, it was found that there had been three major phases. As explained earlier, the program director (who had founded CorCom) came to INMED with the grant, which by the end of year one had led to tension and CorCom’s

separation from INMED, thus ending phase one. The ensuing period of program reorganization and the emergence of the Millennium Alliance in phase two was managed by INMED officials in collaboration with the CTO. It was not until the second quarter of year three that INMED hired a new director, which began phase three. As might be expected, when management responsibility shifts from one phase to another there is a loss of momentum and institutional memory, which makes it difficult to capitalize fully on lessons learned.

## **7.6 Sustainability**

### **Findings:**

- (a) Program sustainability was not included as an objective in the grant agreement. However, the original Business Plan developed by the CorCom director stated that the Service was designed as a “sustainable nonprofit business.” By year three (FY 2001), it was to generate “a substantial part of its operating costs” from the revenue produced, and that, by FY 2003, “the service will be fully independent financially.”
- (b) The sale of materials and services generated only a very small fraction of operating costs during the life of this grant, and it does not appear likely that the program will be financially independent by next year.

### **Conclusions:**

- (a) The market for the types of information and services offered by the Alliance is not yet well enough developed to support the costs associated with program operations.

#### **7.6.1 Overall sustainability survey – N/A**

## **7.7 Financial Management**

### **Findings:**

- (a) While the evaluation team was not charged with an in-depth examination of the Alliance’s financial records, no difficulties were reported with regard to the financial monitoring system.
- (b) The program leveraged a small amount of other resources in the form of dues paid by members of the PVO network in year one, the sale of a few publications and, by year three, fees for services from one corporation. Cost-share requirements were partially met with INMED’s own funds.
- (c) In the absence of any point of comparison, it is not possible to assess accurately the cost-effectiveness of the technical approach applied.

#### **7.7.1 Effectiveness of financial management – N/A**



### **7.7.2 Leveraging other donor funds – N/A**

### **7.7.3 Cost effectiveness of technical approach – N/A**

## **7.8 PVO's Information Management**

### **Findings:**

- (a) Program reports were filed on an annual basis, and were found to be informative and useful. A section on “Lessons Learned and Long-Term Project Implications” was included in the reports for years two and three, though not published or disseminated as separate documents.

## **7.9 Logistics**

### **Findings:**

- (a) In phase one, while INMED offered to provide space, the CorCom director preferred to work from her home in Washington, while the deputy director did work from INMED headquarters in Sterling, Virginia. Program documents indicate that this was a matter of the director's personal convenience, as well as to facilitate easier access to USAID, PVOs and other key offices.

## **7.10 Project Supervision**

### **Findings:**

- (a) Reportedly, there were sufficient staff with the appropriate technical and management skills to oversee program activity.

## **7.11 USAID Management**

### **Findings:**

- (a) The USAID CTO played an active and vital role in the oversight and backstopping of this cooperative agreement. Of particular importance was his work within the Agency to familiarize other offices with the program and seek their support of relevant initiatives. He also met with PPC officials to promote development of Agency policy supportive of partnerships as a new development paradigm. In addition, the CTO was actively involved in identifying and nurturing corporate contacts representing potential partner organizations.

## **8.0 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS**

Taken together, the findings identified through the evaluation process lead to the following overall conclusions:

- ◆ This grant contributed significantly to establishing the concept of nonprofit-private sector partnerships that go beyond traditional philanthropic relations as a new development paradigm.

- ◆ To fully test the hypotheses on which grant activities were based would require a prolonged period of time, since the development of partnerships is an extremely complex, time-consuming process.
- ◆ This grant produced fundamental input for the development of the official USAID policy, which currently promotes and supports partnership initiatives.
- ◆ To maximize the lessons learned through new and “experimental” programming approaches, PVC needs to ensure that grantees closely monitor and fully document all phases of the activity.

## ANNEXES

### *Annex A: Documents Consulted*

Buzzard, S. No date. Concept Paper; Corporate Community Investment Network.

Buzzard, Shirley. 1999. Partnerships with Business: A Practical Guide for Nonprofit Organizations. CorCom.

Corporate Community Investment Service (CorCom). December 19, 1997. Strategic Plan for 1 January-30 August 1998.

CorCom. No date. Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) for CorCom Matching Grant.

CorCom. June 11, 1999. CorCom Business Plan.

CorCom. December 1, 1999. First Year Annual Report.

CorCom. Making Contact: Negotiating a Partnership between Business and Nonprofit Organizations – Report of a Seminar held on April 28, 1998.

CorCom. Lessons Learned from Partnerships between Businesses and Nonprofit Organizations – Report of a Seminar held on May 29, 1998.

CorCom. No date. Public-private partnerships for the Caspian Sea Region: Concept Paper.

CorCom Website. [corcom.org](http://corcom.org)

GAO. April 2002. Foreign Assistance – USAID Relies Heavily on Nongovernmental Organizations, but Better Data Needed to Evaluate Approaches. Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations, Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives.

Godden, John & Buzzard, Shirley. October 27, 1999. Trip Report; Regional Activities in the Caucasus, September 22 to October 2, 1999.

Harrison Burns, Betty. October 28, 1999. ‘Homework’ for CorCom Mediation; Memorandum to Linda Pfeiffer.

INMED. December 1999. PowerPoint presentation to USAID/BHR/PVC.

INMED. No date. Sample Working Agreement Among USAID, SmithKline Beecham Pharmaceuticals and INMED to develop and implement a health and nutrition program through the Millennium Alliance for Social Investment.

Jackson, Thad M. April 24, 1998. Unsolicited concept paper. INMED.

Leveraging USAID PVO Investments; Next Steps for BHR/PVC. No date.

Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. No date. CORCOM/Millennium Alliance Summary of Activities.

Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. No date. Concept Paper outlining a proposal to USAID/Russia to implement a model program to prevent an immediate threat to food security and to accelerate the development and growth of private enterprise in Russia. INMED

Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. January 2002. Children Are the Future: Communities in Change; A Partnership Program for the Dominican/Haitian Border Zone.

Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. November 5, 2001. Prevention and Treatment of HIV/AIDS; A Concept Paper.

Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. No date. Second Year Annual Report. INMED.

Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. January 2002. Third Year Annual Report. INMED.

Millennium Alliance Website. millennium-alliance.org.

Millennium Alliance for Social Investment. No date. Strategic options paper for Johnson&Johnson.

Multisectoral Partnerships. No date. Discussion of USAID/BHR/PVC approaches.

Leonhardt, Tom. February 2000. An Assessment of the Corporate Community Investment Service (The CorCom Network) – Effects on Member Organizations Forming Partnerships. AMA Technologies, Inc.

PACT. No Date. Pact CorCom information sheet.

Sonenthal, Robert. January 21, 2000. Telefax to Thad Jackson, INMED Executive Vice President on: Trademark and Copyright Infringement. Sonenthal and Overall, P.C.

Spevacek, Anne M. October 1, 2001. USAID's Experience with Multi—sectoral Partnerships and Strategic Alliances: An Analysis of Best Practices and Lessons Learned. USAID Development Information Services (DIS).

USAID. No date. Purchase Order for CorCom Workshop; Making Contact: Effective Contacts between PVOs and Business.

USAID/M/OP. September 25, 1999. CorCom II Cooperative Agreement with INMED.

USAID/FAO/OP. June 16, 2000. Modification No.2 to INMED Cooperative Agreement.

USAID/PVC. December 19, 1997. PVC Strategy for Implementation if IR-4: Improved Mobilization of Resources by PVC's PVO Partners.

USAID/PVC. No date. The Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC). PowerPoint presentation.

***Annex B: Persons Contacted***

| <b><i>Name</i></b>    | <b><i>ORGANIZATION &amp; TITLE</i></b>   |
|-----------------------|--|
| Martin Hewitt         | USAID/DCHA/PVC, Team Leader, Matching Grant Program  |
| John Godden           | USAID/E&E, General Business Specialist   |
| Linda Pfeiffer        | INMED, President & CEO   |
| Thad Jackson          | INMED, Executive Vice President  |
| Shirley Buzzard       | Heartlands International, President  |
| Joe Cohen             | AED, Senior Development Specialist   |
| Chanya Charles        | AED, Program Officer   |
| David Ray             | CARE, Director, Campaign & Constituency Building   |
| Bill Howley           | Winrock International, Manager, Planning & Strategic Initiatives                                 |
| Ken Guinta            | InterAction, Vice President  |
| Dan O'Brien           | O'Brien & Associates, President  |
| Chuck Gagel           | Procter & Gamble, Associate Director for Global Nutristar Product Development                    |
| John Dougherty        | Monsanto, former Vice President & General Manager for Eastern Europe (retired)                   |
| Manouchehr Yazhari    | SmithKline Beecham Pharmaceuticals, former Director, Community Treatment Program (retired)       |
| Enrique Reyes Carrión | Foundation for the Social Development of the Americas (of the Montecristi Consortium), President |
| Steven Waddell        | Organizational Futures, Inc. Senior Consultant and Researcher                                    |
| William Witting       | Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs, Vice President, Small Enterprise Development.              |
| John Chromy           | Cooperative Housing Foundation, Director of Program Initiatives                                  |

**INMED MATCHING GRANTS EVALUATION  
STATEMENT OF WORK**

**FINALIZED FOLLOWING  
INMED, MSI & PVC PLANNING MEETING  
(JULY 2002)**

MATCHING GRANTS PROGRAM  
OFFICE OF PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY COOPERATION  
BUREAU FOR HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE  
U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

## **EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK**

“Evaluation is a relatively structured, analytical effort undertaken selectively to answer specific management questions regarding USAID-funded assistance programs or activities.” (USAID ADS chapter 202.4). An evaluation scope of work (SOW) is a plan for conducting an evaluation. A good SOW provides clear directions to the evaluation team.

PVC uses information from the evaluation of the programs it funds as part of a yearly results reporting process. In order to get more consistent information across all Matching Grants (MG) funded programs a standard evaluation format is used. The questions in this evaluation SOW template are the questions that PVC is asking in all programs. INMED has reviewed this template and added sections or questions that reflect its specific information needs.

### **ELEMENTS IN THE SOW**

#### **I. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION**

Include the following:

PVO name

Cooperative agreement number

Date of the evaluation

#### **II. PROGRAM BACKGROUND**

Include the following information:

- Provide basic information on the program that will be evaluated  
Include a short statement on:
  - History of the program
  - Current implementation status
- For each phase of the program (CoreCom and INMED lead phase) provide Program Planning Matrix, logframe or the section from the program design that lists:
  - Objective
  - Indicators
  - Baseline
- Include information about any changes in overall strategy that took place during the course of the program.

#### **III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

This section should contain two components --- (1) identify the evaluation audience and (2) establish a set of evaluation questions that are relevant to each audience. Outline the information needs of the evaluation audience (PVC and INMED), and how each partner will use this information.



- Who wants the evaluation information,
- What do they want to know,
- What will the information be used for,
- When will it be needed, and
- How accurate must the information be?

Note: This activity was funded with Matching Grant (MG) funds in response to an unsolicited proposal. Because of its experimental nature, the grant did not encompass all of the elements of a standard matching grant. Nevertheless, the final evaluation fulfills the requirements of the USAID/DCHA/PVC (MG) Program, and is to provide information that will assist PVC in assessing how well the grant met its objectives; help identify patterns and emerging issues across all MG funded programs; indicate technical support needs for grantees in shaping new RFAs and for reviewing follow-on proposals; develop internal and external documents to demonstrate the effectiveness of the MG program; and share lessons learned with the entire PVO community. PVC will use information outlined in the SOW template in its annual Results Report and in USAID's annual report to Congress. Achievements cited in the evaluation need to be supported by evidence and should be verifiable. Observations on data quality or constraints to interpretation should be stated, as data from these evaluations are used for USAID reporting purposes and are subject to audits. Technical/program opinions and observations are an important element of the evaluation, but should be stated as the evaluator estimate, opinion or forecast. In addition to data concerning performance within the objectives stated in the grant, information about any unexpected results beyond those formal objectives would be helpful and should also be included.

#### IV. THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

##### ▪ EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The following are questions that the PVC MG division is asking in all evaluations. These questions relate to the objectives of the MG division and PVC's strategic plan. The evaluator or evaluation team will assess the following program and institutional questions, provide evidence, criteria for judgment and cite data sources. These questions should address the two distinct phases of the program operations.

INMED has provided input to tailor the SOW to reflect its own information needs.

##### A. Program Implementation

1. Assess progress towards each major objective
  - Based on the logframe/program planning matrix, or statement of program purpose from the proposal, determine if the program objectives have been met, partially met or were unattained. This is the single most important element the evaluation must document and discuss. In addition to the discussion of project results in the text of the evaluation, this information

should also be put into matrix format. List each objective, and key outcomes at the effects and/or impact level. In the text:

- Identify major successes and constraints in achieving objectives and unanticipated effects.

As part of this discussion comment on any constraints that prevented the PVO from measuring achievement of program objectives. If the program does not have “baseline” and end-of-project data from which judgments can be made about the achievement of project objectives, this should be noted and discussed.

- Identify if the project had a detailed implementation plan and any revisions to the plan introduced during the life of the grant in response to changing circumstances or new insights.

- Assess effectiveness of models, approaches or assumption that underlie the project.
- Did the PVO engage in program promotion or policy advocacy? What was the nature, focus and effects of any such promotion or advocacy efforts? How did it differ between the two phases?
- Discuss what the PVO has “learned” implementing this project. Identify if these “lessons learned” have been applied elsewhere (other projects or follow-on activities or how the PVO community adopted the approaches or tools generated under the project).

2. In each phase, describe the types of partnerships promoted by the project and the reaction of target PVOs and businesses. Assess the grantee’s approach to partnership-building, as well as the opportunities and constraints encountered, how the project affected potential partners and the results achieved.

- Assess the process that the grantee used to promote and facilitate PVO-business partnerships.
  - Was a particular approach to assessing potential partnerships developed?
  - How was the capacity of PVOs to build and sustain partnerships with businesses addressed? Were efforts made to strengthen that capacity?
  - How and based on what criteria were target businesses identified?
  - What were the major constraints to effective PVO-business partnerships?
  - Did the project provide or increase access to relevant information by participating PVOs or businesses? How?

- Discuss the degree to which the participating PVOs and businesses contacted through this project consider grant-funded activities to have been of benefit to them and their organizations.
- Describe briefly the overall outcome of the activities undertaken in terms of any PVO-business partnerships formed, in process or abandoned.

## B. Management Capacity/Institutional Strengthening

Because this project was not designed to strengthen the institutional capacity of the grantee, the typical MG capacity-building objectives were not included, nor was funding provided for that purpose. However, since one purpose of the grant was to find ways to build the capability of the PVO community to seek corporate sector funding and to initiate partnerships with businesses, those aspects of the grant are to be addressed.

This section of the evaluation should assess any changes in the operational and management capacity of participating PVOs to initiate or maintain partnerships with the corporate sector as a result of this grant.

- Did association with this project have any noticeable effect on the operational or technical capacity of participating PVOs? Cite the major implementation lessons learned and recommendations.

- Monitoring and Evaluation

Did the grantee implement a process or put into place a system to monitor project performance and collect results (effects or impact) data? Discuss the presence/absence in the grant of the following elements, which usually characterize an M&E system:

- Results oriented objectives and valid indicators;
- Baseline data;
- Collection of start-up and end-of-project data and analysis of differences;
- Use of performance data for project management;
- Attention to recommendations from any previous evaluation.

- Sustainability

- Did the project have a system for addressing financial or operational sustainability?
- Did the project have a business plan?
- Describe the program elements, financial or operational, that were to be sustained (objectives); the means for judging if the sustainability objectives have been achieved (indicators); and sustainability achievements and prospects for post-grant sustainability.
- Identify if the project has any cost-recovery mechanisms, i.e., local level

financing or approaches to generate resources to support project operations. Describe the achievements of these mechanisms and provide an estimate of the magnitude of the system, for example, provide a ratio of costs recovered to operational expenses.

## ■ **OTHER MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS**

### Financial Management

- Were adequate financial monitoring systems in place?
- Did the program leverage other resources?
- How cost-effective was the technical approach?

### Information Management

- Comment on the utility and timeliness of PVOs required reports.
- Did the PVO develop, disseminate and use “lessons learned” from the project?
- Information Technology

### Logistics

- Comment on the adequacy and timeliness of PVO’s material inputs.

## ■ Supervision/HRD

- Assess if there were sufficient staff with the appropriate technical and management skills to oversee program activity.

## ■ USAID Management

Comment on USAID’s oversight and backstopping of this cooperative agreement.

### **Cite the major management lessons learned and recommendations**

## **V. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

*Give a brief description of the evaluation methodology use.*

- *Evaluation approach*
- *Methodology and instruments*
- *Criteria used for judgment, data source, and data analysis.*

### **A. Approach**

The PVO’s program was developed and funded prior to the Agency’s emphasis on results-oriented program designs and the development of PVC’s Strategic Plan. The data from all PVC-funded programs is critical to PVC’s ability to report on achievements against the Office’s Strategic Plan. Until all current PVC-funded programs have made

the transition to a more results-oriented project plans, it will be necessary for the evaluator to conduct a *team-planning meeting* with the PVO and local partners to:

- ◆ refine and consolidate the purpose-level objectives and outputs into a set of results-oriented objectives; and
- ◆ Agree upon a set of appropriate indicators against which the evaluation will assess the achievement of project results outlined in the SOW and will be judged. And where necessary, identify criteria for judgment.

B. Methodology

The Evaluator will:

- ◆ explain the appropriateness of using the data collection approaches;
- ◆ use the Agency's microenterprise (ME) indicators to assess the status of the ME intervention;
- ◆ document data sources (data constraints, quality, etc.); and
- ◆ Provide, a copy (electronic or paper) of all primary data collected and analysis performed.

## VI. TEAM COMPOSITION AND PARTICIPATION

*INSTRUCTIONS:*

*Based on tasks outlined and the emphasis of each evaluation section determine skills needed and who will participate in the evaluation team ---- PVO, NGO and AID staff.*

*Outline:*

- *Roles and responsibility of team leader and members*
- *Language requirements*
- *Technical expertise, or country experience*
- *Evaluation methods and data collection expertise*

## VII. SCHEDULE

*INSTRUCTIONS:*

*Determine:*

- *Time needed at headquarters*
- *Time needed in the field*
- *Time necessary for report writing*

## VIII. REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION REQUIREMENTS

*INSTRUCTIONS:*

- *The SOW will serve as the outline of the report*
- *Delivery schedule*
- *Review/revision policy*



***Annex D: Program DIP and Other Matrices***

**Annex D1: CorCom Detailed Implementation Plan Table**

NOTE: DUE TO DIFFERENT UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE ROLE OF INMED IN CORCOM, THE DIP WAS FINALIZED AND SUBMITTED WITHOUT INMED REVIEW, SO THERE IS LIMITED CURRENT KNOWLEDGE OF THE ACTIVITIES & INDICATORS LISTED.

| Objective/Activity   | Indicator                               | PACD Target          | Accomplishment   | Data verified? <sup>1</sup> | Explanation for Variance                                       | Target Met? |
|--|---|----------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|-------------|
| <b>Goal:</b> To stimulate linkages between business & nonprofit development organizations to pursue their mutual interests in building economically viable and politically stable communities in developing countries. |   |                      |  |                             |  |             |
|  | No indicator                            |                      |  |                             |  |             |
| <b>Objective 1:</b> Establish sustainable mechanisms for promoting partnerships between businesses and PVOs including a network of practitioners, a Business Link Center and a web site.                               |   |                      |  |                             |  |             |
|  | Establishment of web site               | Web site operating   | CorCom web site developed; Millennium Alliance web site created in Year 2 reorganization | Y                           |  | Y           |
|  | # of visitors to web site               | No # specified       |  |                             | No info. available   | Unclear     |
|  | Business Link Center (BLC) in operation | BLC operating        |  | Y                           | Determined that linking partners electronically was premature. | N           |
|  | CorCom income vs. costs                 | No amounts specified | Some income provided from network & sale of materials.                                   | Y                           | No specific targets set.                                       | Unclear     |
| <b>Activities for Objective 1</b>  |   |                      |  |                             |  |             |
| DIP for CorCom   | DIP developed                           | Existence of DIP     | DIP for original CA developed, but not revised/updated for Millennium Alliance in        | Y                           | No revised/updated DIP was required by USAID                   | Y           |

|   |   |                                   |   |                 |  |           |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|-----------|
|   |   |                                   | Year 2 project reorganization.  |                 |  |           |
| Business Plan for CorCom  | CorCom business plan developed            | Existence of CorCom business plan | CorCom Business Plan dated 6/11/99 developed; no Bus. Plan developed for Millennium Alliance in line with Yr. 2 reorganization.                     | Y               | No Business Plan for Millennium Alliance was required by USAID   | Y         |
| Business Plan for Business Link Center  | BLC business plan developed               | BLC business plan                 |   | Y               | Determined with USAID that electronic BLC was premature.   | N         |
| Formal development of Business Link Center with business materials  | No indicator                              | Non-specific                      |   | Y               | (Same)   | N         |
| Establishment of CorCom office with staff and equipment   | No indicator                              | Non-specific                      |   | Y               | Office, equipment & support staff was provided at INMED.   | Y         |
| <b>Objective 2:</b> Build the capacity of PVOs & NGOs to diversify their funding base by building partnerships with business. |   |                                   |   |                 |  |           |
|   | # of paying network members               | Non-specific                      | 9 organizations & individuals paid dues in Year 1; 4 given complimentary membership in exchange for use of office space, services or presentations. | Year 1 Report.  | Year 2 Report: though a few PVOs paid dues in Year 1, it was determined that fee structure would not be sustainable and was dropped. | Partially |
|   | # of network meetings & # of participants | Non-specific                      | 10 network meetings held; 17 PVO & individuals members, plus outside visitors, participated at various times.                                       | (Same as above) |  | Unclear   |
|   | Sources of revenue of network members     | Non-specific                      |   |                 | No information collected   | Unclear   |
|   | # of special initiatives funded           | Non-specific                      |   |                 | (Same)   | Unclear   |



|  |  |                                  |   |                                 |  |   |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
|  | by outside sources   |                                  |   |                                 |  |   |
| <b>Activities for Objective 2</b>  |  |                                  |   |                                 |  |   |
| Publication and distribution of book   | Book published & distributed (no specifics given about type of book) | Book distributed                 | <i>Partnerships with Business: A Practical Guide for Nonprofit Organizations</i> written prior to grant; edited by INMED; a few copies sold, others given away. | Year 1 Report                   |  | Y |
| Skill building sessions with network members   | No indicator   | Non-specific                     | 10 meetings/skill-building sessions held.   | Year 1 Report; CTO verification |  | Y |
| International conference   | International conferences held in years 2 and 3                      | 2 international conferences held |   | Y                               | Plans made, dates set & marketer hired, but conferences postponed due first to disagreement by CorCom Director & later, in consultation w/ CTO, in consideration of new focus on working with USAID to help determine their potential role in working directly w/ companies. | N |
| Expansion of web site  | No indicator   | Non-specific                     |   | Y                               | New web site developed in year 2.  | Y |
| Development of mini-CorCom networks in 3 target countries                                  | Mini-CorCom networks developed in 3 target countries                 | 3 Mini-CorCom networks           |   | Y                               | In consultation with CTO, it was decided that the focus should be on brokering partnerships rather than establishing mini-networks.  | N |
| <b>Objective 3:</b> Educate the private sector about the advantages of nonprofit partners. |  |                                  |   |                                 |  |   |
|  | # of private sector representatives at CorCom                        | Non-specific                     |   | Y                               | Network meetings were geared to nonprofits.  | N |

|   |  |              |   |               |  |           |
|---|--|--------------|---|---------------|--|-----------|
|   | events   |              |   |               | Education took place on one-on-one basis with companies. |           |
|   | # of informational brochures distributed to the private sector                                     | Non-specific | 3 brochures developed for distribution to business & nonprofits.                                      | Year 1 Report |  | Unclear   |
|   | Contributions to CorCom events from the private sector   | Non-specific |   |               |  | N         |
|   | # of phone calls, e-mails, and faxes from private sector firms inquiring about CorCom/partnerships | Non-specific | Over 230 e-mail or telephone responses to individuals, companies & nonprofits requesting information. | Year 1 Report |  | Unclear   |
|   | # of new partnerships developed by Business Link Center  | Non-specific |   | Y             | BLC not developed.                                       | N         |
|   | # of requests for consultancy or assistance by private sector                                      | Non-specific |   |               | No information collected                                 | Unclear   |
| <b>Activities for Objective 3</b>   |  |              |   |               |  |           |
| Participation in business association meetings such as Business for Social Responsibility, The Conference Board | No indicator   | Non-specific | CorCom staff attended BSR, Conference Board and Assn. for Agribusiness conferences                    | Year 1 Report |  | Partially |
| Displays at business association meetings   | No indicator   | Non-specific |   |               | No information collected.                                | Unclear   |
| Book and other publications aimed at business   | No indicator   | Non-specific |   | Y             |  | N         |
| Special sections of web site aimed at business  | No indicator   | Non-specific |   | Y             |  | N         |

## Annex D2: Year 2 CorCom Grant Reorganization: Millennium Alliance Plan Table

| Goal/Objective<br>(No Indicators<br>Included)   | PACD Target  | Accomplishment   | Data<br>verified? | Explanation for<br>Variance  | Target<br>Met? |
|---|--|--|-------------------|--|----------------|
| <b>Goal:</b> Increase private sector funding for development through innovative alliances among PVOs/NGOs, the private sector and USAID.  |  |  |                   |  |                |
| <b>Objective 1:</b> Develop opportunities for alliances between PVOs/NGOs and the private sector that increase funding for development activities that are in line with USAID strategies. |  |  |                   |  |                |
|   | Link 2 or more NGOs with 2 or more existing private sector partners of INMED.  | 2 INMED private sector partners, J&J and El Paso Energy, agreed to work through the Alliance to broker partnerships with PVOs and NGOs in Asia.  | Y                 | Still working to finalize J&J partnerships. El Paso on hold due to corporate downsizing. | Partial        |
|   | With additional funding from a USAID Bureau, Region or Mission, form at least 2 NGO-private sector alliances in that region to address development objectives endorsed by USAID.         | Meetings facilitated & proposals developed by The Alliance for Russia, Bulgaria & Romania for E&E Bureau, Monsanto and local NGOs & international PVOs.  | Y - proposals     | Funding not provided by USAID Regional Bureau.   | N              |
| <b>Objective 2:</b> Broker and help to ensure the success of alliances by providing crucial linkages and supporting services.   |  |  |                   |  |                |
|   | Through agreements at the corporate level with 2 multinational companies operating in the developing world, forge concrete alliances with at least 1 NGO in at least 2 of their markets. | Presented this to corporate level at BP Amoco, Nestle, El Paso, J&J and Exxon.   | Y                 | Still in progress  | Partial        |
|   | TA and supporting services provided to ensure the success of at least 2 NGO-private sector alliances.  | Alliance brokered between:<br>- J&J & Plan International for midwife program in 6 S/SE Asian countries;<br>- Found. for Social Dev. of the Americas & MoniCristi Global Consortium for prog. in border region of Haiti & the DR. | Y                 | (Same)   | Partial        |
| <b>Objective 3:</b> Facilitate 3-way partnerships among USAID, the private sector and PVOs/NGOs.  |  |  |                   |  |                |
|   | At least 2 multi-sector alliances will result from the   | Conference postponed.  | Y                 | Instead of conference,   | N              |

|  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | Millennium conference, with 5 more in the planning stage. |  |  | facilitated meetings between companies & USAID and hired marketing consultant in year 2 to expand base of corporate partners & develop relationships with other facilitating groups including Drucker Fdtn. & Aspen Institute. |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

### ANNEX D3: Evolution of the Program over the Three Year Period of the MG

| SOURCE                             | GOAL   | OBJECTIVES   | STRATEGIES   | OUTCOMES |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|----------|
| 3-yr Coop. Agreement<br>Sept. 1998 | Promote linkages between nonprofit organizations & business in joint ventures that move beyond philanthropy.                           |  | <p>1. Work with PVOs to increase their skills at identifying activities that lend themselves to private sector partnerships &amp; presenting the ideas to business in a way that engages the business in the partnership. Includes continuing CorCom network and expanding it to more private sector members, expanding the website as basis for developing a full business link center with a range of services and developing training materials for PVOs.</p> <p>2. Work with Corp. Community Investment Officers in company funded foundations to help them better understand the concept of strategic investments &amp; business strategies that help the business achieve its strategic objectives</p> <p>3. CorCom will continue to engage the private sector &amp; will develop a formal plan of engagement after another year of information gathering...</p> <p>4. Coordination with USAID. A number of project funded by USAID are working on partnerships, particularly health and family planning. CorCom will serve as facilitator &amp; coordinator for sharing info. on various activities so that individuals are not all approaching the private sector independently.</p> |          |
| DIP Matrix                         | To stimulate linkages between business & nonprofit development organizations to pursue their mutual interests in building economically | 1. Establish sustainable mechanisms for promoting partnerships between businesses & PVOs including a network of practitioners, a Business Link |  |          |

|                         |   |   |   |  |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|--|
|                         | viable and politically stable communities in developing countries.  | Center and a web site.<br><br>2. Build the capacity of PVOs & NGOs to diversify their funding base by building partnerships with business.<br><br>3. Create partnerships by educating the private sector on advantages of working with NGO partners.  |   |  |
| Yr 1 Report<br>Dec.1'99 | (Same)  | (Same – for yr 1 & thru 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter of yr 2)  |   |  |
| Yr 2 Report<br>Nov'00   | Increase private sector funding for development through innovative alliances among PVOs/NGOs, the private sector & USAID. | 1. Develop opportunities for alliances between PVOs/NGOs and the private sector that increase funding for development activities that are in line with USAID strategies.<br><br>2. Broker and help to ensure the success of alliances by providing crucial linkages and supporting services.<br><br>3. Facilitate 3-way partnerships among USAID, the private sector & PVOs/NGOs. | 1. Leverage INMED investments & partnership programs to create opportunities for other PVOs/NGOs.<br><br>2. Initiate a regional demonstration project of a multi-partner dev initiative with the support of the relevant USAID Bur., Region & Mission.<br><br>3. Focusing on a broad USAID-supported dev objective, such as child survival or alleviating poverty, dev agreements with multinational companies at the corp level to promote partnerships with Alliance PVO/NGO partners to all of their market heads.<br><br>4. Launch a new series of Millennium conferences specifically to address the needs of the private sector & promote the formation of alliances with PVOs/NGOs.<br><br>5. Provide direct TA and develop strategic alliances between the Alliance & other complementary initiatives that will provide the services and linkages to ensure the success of the private sector/NGO/USAID | 1. Link 2 or more NGOs with 2 or more existing private sector partners of INMED.<br><br>2. With addl funding from a USAID Bur, Region or Mission, at least 2 NGO-private sector alliances will be formed in that region to address dev objectives endorsed by USAID.<br><br>3. Through agreements at the corp level with 2 multinational companies operating in the developing world, forge concrete alliances with at least 1 NGO in at least 2 of their markets.<br><br>4. At least 2 multi-sector alliances will result from the Millennium conf., with 5 more in the planning stage. |

|                        |        |        |   |  |
|------------------------|--------|--------|---|--|
|                        |        |        | partnerships formed through this initiative.  | 5. TA and supporting services will be provided to ensure the success of at least 2 NGO-private sector alliances. |
| Yr 3 Report<br>Jan '02 | (Same) | (Same) | <p>1. Promote &amp; market the partnership concept and operational modalities that make it attractive for companies to invest in development.</p> <p>2. Offer a range of services that support awareness and linkages between companies and nonprofit orgs.</p> <p>3. Identify partnership opportunities with high success probability.</p> <p>4. Broker partnerships.</p> <p>5. Develop outreach &amp; linkages to other partnership orgs to provide facilitation services to assure success of partnerships.</p> <p>6. Synthesize partnership experience &amp; articulate a range of partnership facilitation models.</p> | (Same)   |

**ANNEX E: Additional CorCom Contract Contacts** <sup>1</sup>

| <b>Foundations and Other Entities</b> | <b>Contact Person</b>          | <b>Notes</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| American Express Foundation           | Terry Savage                   | Sent proposal for CorCom   |
| Aspen Institute                       | Nancy Bearg Dyke, VP           | Met in DC, participated in meeting in Atlanta with USAID Administrator & met in NY with their partnership program coordinator. Developed potential collaboration to enhance Millennium Alliance. |
| Cowles Charitable Trust               | Gardner Cowles, President      | Proposal   |
| Department of Commerce                | Steve Green                    | Met several times to explore possibilities for complementary activities—dialogue continues   |
| Drucker Foundation                    | Frances Hesselbaum, President  | Met in NY and again with board members in CA. Agreed to collaborate as needed to strengthen T.A. to PVOs.  |
| Falconwood Foundation                 | Dr. Stanley Lefkowitz, VP      | Proposal   |
| Hillsdale Fund                        | Mary Scott, Grants Coordinator | Proposal   |
| HKH Foundation                        | Harriet Barlow, Trade Advisor  | Proposal   |
| IFC                                   | Warren Weinstein               | Exchange of information about programs   |
| Morino Institute                      | Bob Templin, VP                | Discussed ways to expand their domestic venture philanthropy partnerships internationally  |
| Mott Foundation                       | Lois DeBacker, Program Officer | Proposal   |
| Nathan Cummings Foundation            | David Miller, Program Officer  | Proposal   |

<sup>1</sup> The contacts in this list include persons with whom there was an ongoing dialogue beyond an initial contact.



| <b>Foundations and Other<br/>Entities</b> | <b>Contact Person</b> | <b>Notes</b>  |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| Organizational Futures, Inc.              | Steve Wadell          | In continuing dialogue about the theory and practice of corporate social investment |
| World Bank                                | Nigel Twose           | Exchange of information about programs  |

| <b>PVOs/NGOs</b>             | <b>CONTACT PERSON</b>  | <b>NOTES</b>  |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Children International       | Jim Cook, President  | Met at Kansas City HQ. Also met with corporate development staff to help with plan for attracting business partnerships |
| Executive Service Corps      | V.P. and others  | Meetings to discuss using their volunteers as part of corporate approach  |
| George Washington University | Jennifer Brinkerhoff, Asst. Professor of Public Administration | Arranged for collaboration on panel for InterAction Forum   |
| InterAction                  | Jim Moody, President   | Series of meetings to discuss working with InterAction & their members  |
| InterAction                  | Lori Rossi   | Arranged for panel presentation at InterAction Forum  |
| PACT                         | Sarah Newhall, President, D.C. & Joel Selwood, Sao Paulo.      | Series of meetings to discuss combining partnership approaches  |
| PACT                         | Phyllis Craun-Selka  | Collaborated on the development of a concept paper on HIV-AIDS for the purpose of seeking corporate sponsors            |
| Partners of the Americas     | Bill Reese   |   |
| Pearl S. Buck Foundation     | Meredith Richardson, President.                                | Met in DC and then with staff in Thailand and introduced them to potential corporate partner                            |
| Plan International           | Donald Cohen, Managing Director for International Development  | Met in DC and then with staff in India and introduced them to potential corporate partner                               |
| Project Concern Int.         | Paul Thompson, President                                       | Met at San Diego HQ. Later met with staff in India and introduced to potential corporate partner.                       |

| <b>PVOs/NGOs</b>        | <b>CONTACT PERSON</b>             | <b>NOTES</b>  |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| SEEP Network            | Dana DeKanter, Executive Director | Arranged for collaboration on panel for InterAction Forum   |
| TransCentury Associates | Lou Mitchell, President           | Collaborated on the development of a concept paper on HIV-AIDS for the purpose of seeking corporate sponsors          |
| Winrock International   | Richard Brown, VP for Programs    | Collaborated on the development of a concept paper on HIV-AIDS for the purpose of seeking corporate sponsors          |
| World Learning          | Bob Chase                         | Met in context of small (about 10 people) gathering of InterAction CEOs to discuss CorCom and how it could help them. |

| <b>BUSINESS</b>                   | <b>CONTACT PERSON</b>  | <b>Notes</b>  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Aventis                           | Dr. John Goose   | Discussed developing a malaria bed net program in Africa with USAID and PVOs/NGOs.  |
| BP Amoco                          | Mary Jane Klocke, Govt. Affairs, London; Jane Paxman, NGO relations, NY; Rich Herold, Govt. Affairs, DC, Michael Townshend, DC | Series of meetings in London, NY and DC. Plans were made for us to organize a meeting for them with PVOs/NGOs working in Angola. They lost their contract in Angola and cancelled plans for the meeting.                          |
| Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenerette     | John Chalsty, Chairman   | Discussed potential business partnership for South Africa. His first priority, however, is New York.  |
| El Paso Energy                    | John Hushon, Byron Kelley  | Kelley succeeded Hushon as President of their International Division. Met with both about organizing NGO partnerships in Indonesia. Were organizing meetings when economic problems began for El Paso, particularly in Indonesia. |
| Exxon                             | Lori Jackson, Public Affairs, Africa Region, DC  | 3 meetings plus proposal sent for CorCom for her to forward to TX HQ  |
| International Chamber of Commerce | President  | Met to discuss partnership and sponsorship of conference  |
| Japanese Commercial Association   | President  | Met in D.C. They did article about CorCom in Japanese trade journal. Also discussed interest in co sponsoring conference  |

| <b>BUSINESS</b>     | <b>CONTACT PERSON</b>   | <b>Notes</b>   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Johnson and Johnson | Conrad Person, Director of International Programs                       | Did consulting for J&J to identify potential partners for Asia community development programs—still in dialogue  |
| Merck               | Tom Bombelles, Public Affairs, DC                                       | First presented CorCom/The Millennium Alliance <sup>2</sup> and later arranged for Merck's participation on ACVFA HIV/AIDS meeting (session organized by The Millennium Alliance)  |
| Monsanto            | John Dougherty  | Extensive Russia, Bulgaria, Romania meetings with USAID and prepared a joint proposal. To include USAID & PVOs/NGOs.   |
| Nestle              | Carlos Represas, Exec. VP, Latin Am. Region, Vevey, Switzerland         | Meeting in Switzerland to present CorCom/The Millennium Alliance to new regional VP  |
| Nortel              | Dan Hunt, President International Division                              | Agreed to sponsorship of and presentation at CorCom conference – then he left the company and they fell into financial difficulties.   |
| Oracle              | Mary Ann Bianco, VP, SFO; Ramiro Valderama, govt. affairs rep, Sterling | Met at San Francisco headquarters and DC govt. affairs office in Sterling, VA. Began plans for their investing through NGOs in Bolivia. Discussions halted with economic downturn. |
| Pfizer              | Paula Luff, Africa Programs   | Met in NY re: developing partnerships for South Africa. Corresponded with Africa representative.   |
| SKB                 | Dr. Manouchehr Yazhari, International Programs, London                  | Met in London and introduced to USAID in DC.   |

<sup>2</sup> The CorCom Project name was changed to The Millennium Alliance Project during the third project year.

| <b>BUSINESS</b>          | <b>CONTACT PERSON</b>  | <b>Notes</b>  |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| U.S. Chamber of Commerce | Stephen Jordan, Partnership Program  | Individual meetings to discuss working together as well as attendance at Chamber workshops  |
| Unocal                   | Bill Ichord, Manager DC office, Laurie Rugelsbrugge, Foundation Mgr. & Greg Huger, new international relations manager | Series of meetings to discuss potential involvement of CorCom and then Millennium Alliance in strategic planning of Foundation & brokering partnerships |
| Western Union            | Piero Coen, Central America Rep.   | Initiated contact after referral from PVC. Followed up through email and phone conversations with a concept paper presented to Mr. Coen.                |